DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 288 209 CS 505 725

AUTHOR Bode, Robert A.
TITLE Ethical Guidelines for Human Communication and Public Discussion: A Gandhian Intercultural Perspective.
PUB DATE Nov 87
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (73rd, Boston, MA, November 5-8, 1987).
PUB TYPE Books (010) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Standards; Codes of Ethics; Communication Research; *Conflict Resolution; *Ethics; Interpersonal Communication; *Persuasive Discourse; *Public Speaking
IDENTIFIERS *Gandhi (Mahatma); Nonviolence

ABSTRACT

Ethical communication scholars frequently find national popular rhetoric unethical. Some proposed ethical guidelines for the public presentation of ideas call for such elements as habits of search, justice, preference for public versus private motives, respect for dissent, airing of all relevant arguments, and persuasion without coercion or suppression of evidence. Mahatma Gandhi's means for resolving differences publicly conform to such guidelines of ethical public communication. Gandhi's method for interacting with others--satyagraha, or the pursuit of truth--addresses the problem of how to engage in conflict (including public discussion) in a constructive rather than an annihilating way. The tenets of satyagraha (truth, nonviolence, and self-suffering) provide that communicating individuals (1) develop an interacting force with their opponent that enables a new pattern of interaction to emerge; (2) reject acts of violence, symbolic violence, and absolutes, and instead seek truth between conflicting parties as a mutually satisfactory solution as yet unknown; (3) seek triumph not in their position but over the situation by realizing a synthesis of opposing claims; and (4) be prepared to abandon a previous position and embrace that of the opponent if so persuaded. Gandhi's method focuses on the interaction itself, one's overall communication orientation, and, uniquely, the absence of violence. (JG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED288209

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ETHICAL GUIDELINES FOR HUMAN COMMUNICATION AND PUBLIC DISCUSSION: A GANDHIAN INTERCULTURAL PERSPECTIVE

by

Robert A. Bode

Graduate Student
Department of Rhetoric & Communication
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403
Message (503)686-4171
Home (503)484-5240

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert A. Bode

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS505725

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Prominent thinkers and writers have advocated free and open expression of opinions. John Stuart Mill is regarded by many as a democratic philosopher, as he advocates freedom of public discussion in "On Liberty." Mill does not, however, provide ethical guidelines for communicators who meet publicly. This paper partially reviews literature in which ethical guidelines for human communication and public discussion are recommended. After completing the partial review, attention shifts to Mahatma Gandhi and his philosophy. The argument becomes that Gandhi establishes ethical guidelines for interaction in public. His views meet many ethical guidelines established by communication ethicists; he provides us with unique and workable methods for public interaction; and his methods, philosophical orientations, and symbolic behaviors deserve to be emulated by public discussants who interact across cultures.

The First Amendment to the Constitution contains the phrase, "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech."[1] As Alexander Meiklejohn interprets the phrase, he draws three observations. "First, let it be noted that, by these words, Congress is not debarred from all action upon freedom of speech."[2] Zechariah Chafee, Jr. echoes this claim, as he suggests that proper limitations upon freedom of expression may exist, and that one does not have the right to say anything he or she wants "anywhere and at any time."[3] Meiklejohn further states, ". . . second, no one who reads with care the text of the First Amendment can fail to be startled by its absoluteness. The phrase, 'Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech,' is unqualified. It admits of no exceptions."[4] Third, argues Meiklejohn, the phrase is "strangely paradoxical" for it "does not forbid the abridging of speech. . . . it does forbid the abridging of the freedom of speech."[5]

Other scholars make cogent arguments favoring free speech. Thomas Emerson writes:

> The right to freedom of expression is justified first of all as the right of an individual purely in his capacity as an individual. It derives from the widely accepted premise of Western thought that the proper end of man is the realization of his character and potentialities as a human being . . . thought and communication are the fountainhead of all expression of the individual personality. To cut off the flow at the source is to dry up the whole stream. . . .[6]

Another scholar, John Stuart Mill, might be most noted for his position on freedom of speech, and, in particular, public

discussion. His essay, "On Liberty," is a frequently cited source for scholars of public discussion; and Mill is considered a prominent philosopher of democratic ideals.

"On Liberty" is a provocative and eloquent statement which argues against the suppression of conflicting opinions. The suppression of opinions, suggests Mill, has "worse consequences than not suppressing" opinions.[7] Chapter II of Mills' essay "On Liberty" contains the often quoted statement which may characterize Mills' position on public discussion. "If all mankind minus one, were of one opinion, and only one person were of the contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person, than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind."[8] In the same chapter, Mill advances the idea that opinions should be "frequently, and fearlessly discussed."[9] Taken together, these two statements can be considered earmarks of Mills' philosophy, with regard to the public expression of opinions. While summarizing Chapter II, Mill further suggests that through the "collision of adverse opinions . . . [and through] . . . vigorously and earnestly" contesting ideas truth emerges. Mill discusses other freedoms (e.g., thought, feeling, and publishing), but this paper focuses upon the clash of ideas in the public situation.

Mills' position is elegantly stated, and he provides us with a philosophy which warrants our serious consideration. One scholar recently states "that Mill held a cohesive set of doctrines that are complex, interesting, and philosophically

stronger than traditional interpretations have credited him."[10] Mill was a prolific and scholarly writer who advanced our thinking in political theory and public discussion. Upon reading "On Liberty," I am, however, struck with two observations. First, John Stuart Mill seems to have been an idealist. Second, he does not seem to have been a pragmatist. Neither of these observations are intended to be condemnations of Mill's ideas. However, an important question can be asked: What ethical guidelines can be discovered, in order to serve as practical vehicles for guiding us as we meet across cultural lines for public discussion of conflicting opinions?

In an attempt to answer this question, I shall offer some ethical guidelines recommended by thinkers who concern themselves with human communication in general, and public discussion in particular. As the focus of the paper narrows, the position taken is that Mahatma Gandhi offers a practical means of resolving differences publicly. First, ethical guidelines offered by a potpourri of authors who have dealt with the ethics of communication and public discussion are offered.

Karl R. Wallace develops a political perspective where he isolates four values which he believes are basic to the welfare of our political system: "respect, or belief in the dignity and worth of the individual; fairness, or belief in equality of opportunity; freedom coupled with responsible exercise of freedom; and belief in each person's ability to understand the nature of democracy."[11] Wallace suggests that, "First,

a communicator in a free society must recognize that during the moments of his utterance he is the sole source of argumentation and information."[12] Public communicators concerned with this guideline can ask themselves the question: "Can I answer squarely, without evasion, any relevant question that a hearer might ask?"[13] In an attempt to answer this question the arguer is encouraged to develop the habit of search.[14]

"Second, the communicator who respects the democratic way of life must select and present fact and opinion fairly."[15] Communicators, in their attempts to follow this guideline, can ask: "In the selection and presentation of my materials, am I giving my audience the opportunity of making fair judgments?"[16] By addressing this test the communicator is called on to develop the habit of justice.[17]

"Third, the communicator who believes in the ultimate values of democracy will invariably reveal the sources of his information and opinion."[18] In keeping with this guideline, communicators should help their hearers examine sources so as to discover bias and prejudice inherent in sources. The critical question to ask is: "Have I concealed information about either my source materials or my own motives which, if revealed, would damage my case?"[19] As communicators ask the question, they develop the "habit of preferring public to private motivations."[20]

"Fourth, a communicator in a democratic society will acknowledge and will respect diversity of argument and opinion . . . [and will ask the question] . . . Can I freely admit the

force of opposing evidence and argument and still advocate a position which represents my convictions."[21] The habit of respect for dissent is encouraged through the fourth guideline.[22]

The four previously mentioned guidelines, the test questions related to each, and the respective habits are, according to Wallace, worth considering as we attempt to discover an ethical basis of communication. James Chesebro addresses the question of ethical standards for communication and offers five points to consider.

> The first ethical standard in communication requires that a speaker enhance the political ideals of a democracy. . . . The second ethical standard would require that the speaker enhance the development of the individual. . . . The third ethical standard would require that the speaker employ means consistent with society's prescriptions. . . . The fourth ethical standard would require that the speaker enhance the communication process itself. . . . The fifth and final ethical standard would require that the speaker determine wisely the stress of the situation in setting goals and techniques.[23]

Dennis Day argues for an ethic of democratic debate when he states: "The highest ethical obligation of democratic debate is a commitment to full and effective expression of arguments and opinions relevant to decision."[24] Two other scholars who deal directly with the political perspective are Thomas Nilsen and Sidney Hook.

Nilsen sees values which are essential to democracy as: "intrinsic worth of the human personality, reason as an instrument of individual and societal development, self-determination as the means to individual fulfillment, and human realization of individual potentialities."[25] The touchstone governing

Nilsen's guidelines is significant choice. He describes significant choice as "free, informed, and critical choice . . . that is voluntary, free from physical or mental coercion . . . based on the best information available."[26]

As Hook provides guidelines for scrutinizing public communicators, "He questions the ethics of communication tactics which suppress relevant evidence, which foster refusal to listen to opposing views, and which fanatically make the holding of a particular idea synonymous with patriotism."[27] Hook provides several ground rules, which, in abbreviated form are:

> 1. Nothing and no one is immune from criticism. 2. Anyone involved in a controversy has an intellectual responsibility to inform himself of the facts. 3. Criticism should be directed first at policies, and against persons only when they are responsible for policies, and against their motives or against their purposes only when there is some independent evidence of their character, not derived from the consequences of their policies. 4. Because certain words are legally permissible, they are not therefore morally permissible. 5. Before impugning an opponent's motive, even when they legitimately may be inpugned, answer his arguments. 6. Do not treat an opponent of a policy as if he were therefore a personal enemy of the country or a concealed enemy of democracy. 7. Since a good cause may be defended by bad arguments, after answering those bad or invalid arguments, present positive evidence in behalf of your own position, or for your own alternatives. 8. Do not hesitate to admit lack of knowledge or to suspend judgment if the evidence is not decisive either way. 9. Only in pure logic and mathematics and not in human affairs can you demonstrate that something is impossible. Because something is logically possible, it is not therefore probable. The phrase "it is not impossible" really is a preface to an irrelevant statement about human affairs. In human affairs, especially in politics, the question always is one of the balance of probabilities. The evidence of probabilities must include more than abstract possibilities. 10. When we are looking for truth of fact or wisdom of policy, the cardinal

> sin is to refuse to discuss, or the taking of action that blocks discussion, especially when it takes the form of violence.[28]

When communicators exchange ideas publicly, persuasion is both implicitly and explicitly present. B. J. Diggs argues that in order to be ethically right, the "one who tries to persuade must have the right or. . . and if he also has an obligation, he must exercise it."[29] Diggs' position includes the beliefs that when communicators attempt to persuade, they must try to persuade in "a morally right way;" they must see their goal as the "right thing to do;" and that their goal must be supported by "good grounds for thinking," that the goal or action is worthwhile.[30]

At the 1985 national Speech Communication Association (SCA) meeting, a panel of educators presented papers which could be considered the state of the art with regard to theory, research, and practice in communication ethics. As scholars interested in ethics, they have established an SCA sanctioned group called the Commission on Communication Ethics. Presenters were Ron Arnett from Marquette University, Richard Johannesen from Northwestern University, Kenneth Anderson from the University of Illinois, and J. Vernon Jensen from the University of Minnesota.

Arnett has recently reviewed the literature on communication ethics, and concludes that five perspectives to communication ethics can be established. They are the democratic; universal/humanitarian; standards, codes, and procedures; contextual; and narrative ethical perspectives.[31] A major concern, from the

democratic perspective, is said to be that the current political climate is one which is quite intolerant of dissent. The universal/humanitarian perspective might be best summarized as the perspective which seeks to establish standards for being human. The focus is upon moral stages. The standards, codes, and procedures perspective focuses upon discovering publicly acceptable standards for judging communication. Contextual ethics is relativistic in nature, and in a sense opposes the standards, codes, and procedures perspective. The contextual ethical perspective is, in large part, rooted in culture and cultural similarities and dissimilarities. The narrative ethical perspective roots itself in storytelling. By analyzing stories, the suggestion is that writers provide ethical guidelines, without specifically stating exactly what readers are to do.

Johannesen is most interested in critically analyzing various communication contexts. His interests include ethical guidelines relevant to intimate and interpersonal relationships; those that govern or are related to verbal and nonverbal communication, cross-cultural communication, intentional vagueness in communication, and racist and sexist communication.[32] Johannesen criticizes communication ethics scholars by suggesting our foci are perhaps too narrow. He argues that there has been significant emphasis upon national rhetoric and too little upon local, state, and regionally oriented rhetoric. He further argues that the need to focus upon rhetoric which dehumanizes is warranted.

Kenneth Anderson presents a novel argument when he suggests that communication ethicists might attend to ethical questions regarding non-participants of the actual communication event.[33] At the center of Anderson's position are the beliefs that non-participants in the actual event lay a claim upon the situation, because they have a right to intervene; and non-participants create the moral spine of the public which participants use as a perceived guide to their communication.[34]

J. Vernon Jensen also presents a novel point of view when he states that we might concern ourselves with ethical guidelines for the whistleblower.[35] A whistleblower is a person who calls attention, often public attention, to ethical concerns. Whistle-blowing, according to Jensen, is becoming more socially acceptable in a number of contexts. He states that ethical practices of particular companies, business in general, various professions, governmental agencies, religious cults, and politics have been recently discussed publicly by the whistleblower. Jensen suggests there are two categories of ethical concerns for whistleblowers. Those concerns can be procedural and substantive.[36] Procedural concerns can be addressed by answering the following test questions. How ethically has the whistleblower received the information? Have the whistleblower's motives been aired? Has the situation been fully explored by the whistleblower? When should the whistle be blown? Should the whistle be blown anonymously or openly? With what intensity and how often should the whistle be blown? How right is it to shift

from a participant in the event to a whistleblower? How ethical is whistleblowing if the costs are high? Substantive concerns deal primarily with multiple loyalties and can be addressed by answering the following test questions. What are one's obligations to the organization? Will the revelation of information truly damage the organization? Was a pledge to silence, if made by the whistleblower, justifiable? What are the moral obligations to others in the organization? What are the moral obligations to the profession? What of the responsibilities to family and friends? What of the responsibilities to self? What is the general obligation to the public? What effects, if any, will there be upon such bedrock values as loyalty, fairness, courage, and justice? These questions, as well as others, suggests Jensen, can be used as ethical guidelines for the whistleblower.

When an attempt is made to discover ethical guidelines related to public communication, and human communication in general, one can discover many different points of view. A brief review of the guidelines thus far mentioned reminds us that we cannot say anything at any time. The constitutional language of the First Amendment appears unqualified and yet paradoxical. Mill argues that suppressing opinions has serious consequences, and that truth emerges through the contesting of ideas. Mill may be more idealist than pragmatist in his essay "On Liberty," and yet many noted thinkers try to give us practical ethical

guidelines to follow, as we meet for the public presentation of ideas.

The guidelines, test questions, and habits articulated by Wallace may serve as a point of beginning. Chesebro's standard which calls for the speaker to enhance political ideals may be worth recalling. Day states that all arguments relevant to the debate deserve to be aired. Nilsen and Hook respectively state that significant choice, and communication tactics deserve to be considered. Diggs suggests guidelines for persuaders, and advocates persuasion should be done in a morally right way. Arnett establishes that there are democratic; universal/ humanitarian; standards, codes, and procedures; and narrative ethical perspectives. Johannesen suggests we should seek to discover ethical guidelines for various communication contexts which range from intimate to cross-cultural situations. Anderson's position about how non-participants impact the situation are reviewed, and finally Jensen's guidelines for the whistleblower are mentioned.

After partially reviewing the literature which relates to the establishment of ethical guidelines for public discussion and human communication, I wonder if it is even possible for a communicator to, at all times, meet all of the ethical criteria previously discussed. The pessimist in me says that to live up to all the criteria is impossible. The optimist in me says the theory behind the guidelines is sound, and yet I wonder if there are models who come close to practicing the theory. The

focus of this paper now begins to shift toward a discussion of Mahatma Gandhi. As the remainder of this effort is developed arguments are presented that: Mahatma Gandhi was an ethical public communicator who deserves to be emulated.

Earlier the point was made that a great deal of the ethical communication criticism focuses upon national rhetorical situations. Communication scholars frequently analyze the rhetoric of popular rhetors, judge them to be unethical, and then recommend ethical guidelines. In the remainder of this paper, a different tack is taken. An attempt is made to examine some of Gandhi's political ideology, to review his guidelines for action and interaction, and to argue that his guidelines are ethical for the public communicator who speaks across cultures.

While Gandhi had a unique set of beliefs, he was not an academic theorist who laid down specific rules or precepts to which one should adhere. Rather, he was a practical philosopher, a man of action, and a creator of possibilities.[37] Gandhi's philosophy was one of peace and nonviolence; however, according to Bose, Gandhi did not formulate his philosophy through a systematic presentation of nonviolence as a set of statements.[38] Even though Gandhi did not put forth a systematic presentation, or a set of specific statements expressing his idology, scholars analyze his writings, his apparent beliefs, and his behaviors. By examining a portion of the Gandhian literature, we will not be looking at what should be avoided in public communication. Rather, we will be looking at a model who practices ethical guidelines, which I believe are worthy of emulation.

Gandhi's unique method for interacting with others, if adopted as an ethical strategy, may create a workable means of public discussion. The Gandhian contribution, more directly than many efforts in history, speaks to fundamental questions of humankind: how can conflict be conducted constructively; how can humankind engage in conflict (and I would add public discussion) without the danger of annihilation?[39]

Gandhi offered us a design for interaction that is sophisticated, dynamic, and creative.[40] Gandhi named his political technique satyagraha which, literally translated, means truth force.[41] Satyagraha is an irresistable pursuit of truth, and its objective is not to assert propositions, but to create possibilities.[42] In opening up new choices, and in confronting an opponent with the demand that he make a choice, the satyagrahi involves himself in an act of ethical existence.[43] An analysis of Gandhi's techniques leads us to "fruitful formulations essential for communication."[44] "One who uses satyagraha develops an interacting force with his opponent, and this produces new movement which may change the direction or even the content of the forces."[45]

When conflicting parties clash publicly, they may become locked into conflict spirals. Each party may conclude that they have the correct view of reality, or each party may hold a vision of what they consider to be true. Watzlawick suggests that when persons believe their version of reality is the only correct view of reality, that this is "the most dangerous of

all delusions."[46] Orr suggests that rhetoric may be used to perpetuate the delusion that one's view of reality is the only reality.[47]

Gandhi's technique for action, Satyagraha, consists of three basic precepts: truth, nonviolence, and self-suffering.[48] These tenets, and their interrelationships, are essential to understand if one is to become familiar with satyagraha as a means of conflict resolution. In John Bondurant's Conquest of Violence: The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict, these themes are treated in detail and need not be discussed here in depth. The focus, at this point, is to make a connection between Gandhi's dynamic and creative techniques for conflict resolution and human communication. First, one who uses satyagraha develops an interacting force with one's opponent, and this new dynamic engages an opponent in such a manner so as to transform the relationships so that a new pattern (of interaction) emerges.[49] Second, the Gandhian dialectic rejects acts of violence and symbolic violence.[50] The Gandhian dialectic operates by admission to relative truths and rejection of absolutes.[51] In a nonviolent manner Gandhi engaged his opponents with constructive and peaceful attitudes and sought to enlarge areas of agreement and to achieve resolution of conflict by persuasion. Gandhi insisted on the "process" . . . which leads to solutions yet unknown.[52] Using contemporary communication terminology we can say Gandhi was rhetorically sensitive. The clash of ideas, within any given situation said Gandhi, aims at achieving satisfaction to both conflicting

parties in such a way as to present an entirely new circumstance; and, through the operation of nonviolent action, the search for truth was believed to lie between conflicting parties and would emerge in the form of a mutually satisfactory and agreed-upon solution.[53] The Gandhian dialectic has many unique characteristics that are perhaps foreign to some conflict resolution techniques. One unique idea is the notion of synthesis.

Satyagrahis realize the goal is not the triumph of their position--rather, the goal is to realize a synthesis of opposing claims. The satyagrahi attempts to persuade but at the same time invites the opponent to dissuade and at all times the satyagrahi is prepared to abandon a previously held position and embrace the opponent's position if so persuaded.[54] The satyagrahi seeks victory not over the opponent but over the situation in the best synthesis possible.[55]

Gandhi's method of conflict resolution creates a whole new pattern of interaction between conflicting parties, focuses upon the interaction itself, and aims at reaching a workable truth between parties that is situation bound. The absence of violence, real and symbolic, also makes the Gandhian perspective unique. Important to the Gandhian method of conflict resolution is one's overall communication orientation. In order to understand Gandhi's communication orientation it may be helpful to examine what some communication scholars say of Gandhi and his method of interaction.

Beatty, Behnke, and Banks suggest that Gandhi could be characterized as a dialogical communicator.[56] Johnannesen

claims that a dialogical communication orientation is humane, facilitative of self-fu_fillment, authentic, actualizing, helping, caring, and supporting.[57] Buber claims that attitudes and behaviors of dialogical communicators are characterized by qualities such as mutuality, open-heartedness, directness, honesty, spontaniety, frankness, lack of pretense, nonmanipulative intent, communion, intensity, and love.[58] When attempting to understand dialogical communication, the focus is drawn to attitudes toward each other as held by the participants in a communication transaction.[59]

In short, Gandhi met his opponents, often publicly with a rhetorical posture characterized as dialogical, asserts Beatty, et al. These scholars analyze transcripts of Gandhi's public presentations; and then report first-hand accounts of his interactional style in groups and interpersonal settings, while he attended the Second Round Table Conference in London. The conference was held to publicly discuss the possibilities for self-government in India, and to propose ideas for a new Indian constitution.[60]

Conclusion and Connections

The assumption governing this paper is that, in spite of Mills' wisdom and eloquence, he does not provide ethical guidelines for public discussion. The central question in this effort is: What ethical guidelines can be discovered in order to serve us as practical vehicles for guiding us as we meet

for the public discussion of conflicting opinions? Many ethical guidelines, values, test questions, and several different ethical perspectives for judging human communication have been discussed. The final portion of this paper is designed to draw connections between some ethical issues offered by scholars contained herein, and Gandhi's method of interaction.

In an attempt to argue that Gandhi offers us a practical means for resolving differences publicly, the task is to review some of the ethical guidelines previously mentioned, and to suggest how Gandhi's philosophy meets many of the guidelines. The beauty of Gandhi's philosophy seems to rest with its flexibility.

You may recall Wallace, who says that communicators should strive to accomplish the habits of search, justice, preference for public versus private motives, and respect for dissent. With these habits in mind, please note that Gandhi's search for truth is rooted in the belief that truth lies somewhere in between conflicting parties. Interactions between conflicting parties, which follow Gandhian principles are, essentially, searches for justice which admit private motives may have to be yielded to public motives that are co-jointly worked out. Respect for dissent, or the other's opinions, appears inherent to the Gandhian orientation.

Chesebro argues for an ethical standard which requires speakers to enhance the communication process itself. Gandhian philosophy appears to align nicely with this point of view, in

as much as Gandhi insisted that the interaction process itself was capable of leading to solutions yet unknown.

With regard to democratic debate, Day calls for guidelines encouraging full and effective expression of arguments and opinions relevant to decisions. Gandhi sought to develop an interaction force with his opponents. This interaction force is believed to produce new movement. In essence, the interaction between parties allows arguments to emerge; and the arguments move and shape the direction of decisions.

The touchstone which governs Nilsen's guidelines is significant choice, which is said to exist if the choice is made free from physical and mental coercion. One fundamental tenet of Gandhi's relates to this; nonviolence, and his method of interaction and conflict resolution calls for an absence of both real and symbolic violence.

Hook presents us with guidelines which question the communication tactic which suppresses relevant evidence, and/or the tactic of refusing to listen. Horace Alexander offers a first-hand account of how Gandhi adheres to these guidelines. Alexander observed Gandhi at the Second Round Table Conference:

> While I watched him in London, I was again and again impressed with his patent desire to meet his political opponents and to sit down with them. And always he showed the genuine courtesy of a man who would seriously listen to his opponent with the hope of understanding him better and perhaps learning something new. Indeed, this very generosity towards his opponents was often alarming to his political colleagues. They never knew when he might come away from some talk with a British statesman--or indeed, with some much less important person saying--; "I must change my line of action. I have learnt something that I have overlooked."[61]

As Arnett provides categories for ethical guidelines, he mentions a democratic, ethical concern of today, which is that the present political climate is intolerant of dissent. Gandhi so believed in dissent that he was prepared to abandon his previously held position if so persuaded. The goal for Gandhi was to realize a synthesis of opposing claims.

A salient point made by Johannesen is that as concerned scholars, we should examine local, state and regional as well as national rhetoric. Gandhi, of course, was involved in many campaigns which ranged from local to international in scope. An analysis of his rhetoric may prove to be fertile ground for ethical research. Another important point made by Johnannesen is that we should avoid dehumanizing rhetoric across situations. Once again, Gandhi's rejection of real and symbolic violence appears worth restating.

Anderson provides us with a host of ethical questions regarding non-participants. Gandhi addressed the issue of what may be called participants and non-participants. He, suggests Bondurant, had rules which govern satyagrahis and protestors. She, in a sense, lays out a Gandhian handbook, and in it she includes fundamental rules, a code of discipline, and steps in a satyagraha campaign.[62]

Jensen discusses ethical guidelines for the whistleblower and argues that whistleblowers must be prepared to pay some kinds of costs. The Gandhian philosophical tenet of self-suffering directly relates to this belief. Those who are even

remotely familiar with Gandhi, know that he, and frequently many of his followers, paid very high costs as they called attention to issues. As a whistleblower, one can argue, Gandhi both knew and expected to be held accountable for his actions. He willingly held himself responsible for his actions.

Finally, not only did Gandhi meet and sometimes exceed ethical guidelines advocated for public discussion, but he also established guidelines that were uniquely his own. Perhaps it is the guideline of nonviolence for which Gandhi is most noted. At a time when public discussants appear willing to rhetorically rape their opponents, perhaps we need to be reminded of a philosophical and ethical orientation, which recommends abstention from real and symbolic violence. When concerned with intercultural interactions, Gandhi's views appear especially worthwhile.

End Notes

[1] Alexander Meiklejohn, Political Freedom: The Constitutional Powers of the People (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1948), p. 19.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Zechariah Chafee, Jr., Free Speech in the United States (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1948), p. 3.

[4] Meiklejohn, p. 20.

[5] Ibid., p. 21.

[6] Franklyn S. Haiman, Freedom of Speech (Skokie, IL: National Textbook Company, 1981), p. 204.

[7] D. H. Monroe, "Utilitarianism and the Individual," in New Essays on John Stuart Mill and Utilitarianism, ed., Wesley E. Cooper, Kai Nielsen, and Steven C. Patten (Guelph, Ontario: Canadian Association for Publishing in Philosophy, 1979), p. 47.

[8] John Stuart Mill, "On Liberty," in The Six Great Humanistic Essays of John Stuart Mill (New York: Washington Square Press, Inc., 1963), p. 138.

[9] Ibid., p. 159.

[10] Fred R. Berger, Happiness, Justice, and Freedom: The Moral and Political Philosophy of John Stuart Mill (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), p. 1.

[11] Richard L. Johannesen, Ethics in Human Communication (Wayne, NJ: Avery Publishing Group, Inc., 1978), p. 21.

[12] Karl R. Wallace, "An Ethical Basis of Communication," The Speed Teacher 4 (January 1955), p. 6.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid., p. 7.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Ibid., p. 8.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Ibid., p. 9.

[22] Ibid.

[23] James W. Chesebro, "A Construct for Assessing Ethics in Communication," Central States Speech Journal 20 (Summer 1969), pp. 108-9.

[24] Dennis G. Day, "The Ethics of Democratic Debate," Central States Speech Journal 17 (February 1966), p. 14.

[25] Johannesen, pp. 24-5.

[26] Thomas R. Nilsen, Ethics of Speech Communication 2d ed. (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1974), p. 72.

[27] Johannesen, p. 26.

[28] Ibid., p. 27.

[29] B. J. Diggs, "Persuasion and Ethics," The Quarterly Journal of Speech 50 (December 1964), p. 370.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Ron Arnett, Richard Johannesen, Kenneth Anderson, and J. Vernon Jensen, "Theory, Research, and Practice in Communication Ethics," tape recorded at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Denver, Colorado, 8 November 1985.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Ibid.

[35] Ibid.

[36] Ibid.

[37] Anima Bose, "A Gandhian Perspective on Peace," Journal of Peace Research 18 (1981), pp. 159-61.

[38] Ibid., p. 159.

[39] Joan V. Bondurant, Conquest of Violence: The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969), p. xi.

[40] Ibid., p. x.

[41] Erik H. Erikson, Gandhi's Truth: On the Origins of Militant Nonviolence (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1969), p. 198.

[42] Bondurant, pp. v-vii.

[43] Ibid., p. vii.

[44] Ibid.

[45] Ibid., p. viii.

[46] Paul Watzlawick, How Real Is Real? (New York: Random House, 1976), p. xiii.

[47] C. Jack Orr, "How Shall We Say: 'Reality is Socially Constructed Through Communication,'" Central States Speech Journal 29 (1978), p. 264.

[48] Bondurant, pp. 15-36.

[49] Ibid., p. viii.

[50] Ibid., p. ix.

[51] Ibid., p. 193.

[52] Ibid., p. 194.

[53] Ibid., p. 195.

[54] Ibid., p. 196.

[55] Ibid.

[56] Michael J. Beatty, Ralph R. Behnke, and Barbara Jane Banks, "Elements of Dialogic Communication in Gandhi's Second Round Table Conference," The Southern Speech Communication Journal 44 (Summer 1979), p. 390.

[57] Johannesen, p. 43.

[58] Richard L. Johannesen, "The Emerging Concept of Communication as Dialogue," The Quarterly Journal of Speech 57 (1971), p. 373.

[59] Johannesen, Ethics in Human Communication, p. 43.

[60] Beatty, et al.

[61] Horace Alexander, Gandhi Through Western Eyes (London: Asia Publishing House, 1969), p. 77.

[62] Bondurant, pp. 38-41.

Bibliography

Alexander, Horace. Gandhi Through Western Eyes. London: Asia Publishing House, 1969.

Arnett, Ron, Richard Johannesen, Kenneth Anderson, and J. Vernon Jensen. "Theory, Research, and Practice in Communication Ethics." Tape recorded at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Denver, Colorado, 8 November 1985.

Beatty, Michael J., Ralph R. Behnke, and Barbara Jane Banks. "Elements of Dialogic Communication in Gandhi's Second Round Table Conference. The Southern Speech Communication Journal 44 (Summer 1979):389-96.

Berger, Fred R. Happiness, Justice, and Freedom: The Moral and Political Philosophy of John Stuart Mill. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Bondurant, Joan V. Conquest of Violence: The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969.

Bose, Anima. "A Gandhian Perspective on Peace." Journal of Peace Research 18 (1981):159-61.

Chafee, Zechariah Jr. Free Speech in the United States. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1948.

Chesebro, James W. "A Construct for Assessing Ethics in Communication." Central States Speech Journal 20 (Summer 1969):104-14.

Day, Dennis G. "The Ethics of Democratic Debate." Central States Speech Journal 17 (February 1966):5-14.

Diggs, B. J. "Persuasion and Ethics." The Quarterly Journal of Speech 50 (December 1964):359-73.

Erikson, Erik H. Gandhi's Truth: On the Origins of Militant Nonviolence. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1969.

Haiman, Franklyn S. Freedom of Speech. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Company, 1981.

Johannesen, Richard L. Ethics in Human Communication. Wayne, NJ: Avery Publishing Group, Inc., 1978.

Johannesen, Richard L. "The Emerging Concept of Communication as Dialogue." The Quarterly Journal of Speech 57 (1971): 373-85.

Meiklejohn, Alexander. Political Freedom: The Constitutional Powers of the People. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1948.

Mill, John Stuart. "On Liberty." In The Six Great Humanistic Essays of John Stuart Mill. New York: Washington Square Press, Inc., 1963.

Monroe, D. H. "Utilitarianism and the Individual." In New Essays on John Stuart Mill and Utilitarianism. Ed. Wesley E. Cooper, Kai Nielsen, and Steven C. Patten. Guelph, Ontario: Canadian Association for Publishing in Philosophy, 1979.

Nilsen, Thomas R. Ethics of Speech Communication. 2d ed. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1974.

Orr, C. Jack. "How Shall We Say: 'Reality is Socially Constructed Through Communication.'" Central States Speech Journal 29 (1948):263-74.

Wallace, Karl R. "An Ethical Basis of Communication." The Speed Teacher 4 (January 1955):1-9.

Watzlawick, Paul. How Real is Real? New York: Random House, 1976.